

REMARKS

The Advisory Action of June 22, 2007 was received and carefully reviewed. Claims 1-3, 7-9, 13, 14, 17 and 18 are pending, of which claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 13 and 17 are amended to add clarities, and of which claims 1, 7, 13 and 17 are independent. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the currently pending rejection are requested for the reasons advanced in detail below.

Filed concurrently herewith is a *Request for a One-Month Extension of Time* which extends the shortened statutory period of response to July 15, 2007.

In the most recent Office Action, claims 1-3, 7-9, 13-14 and 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sundahl et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. 2004/0212573 – hereafter Sundahl) in view of Ishizuka (U.S. Patent No. 6,479,940 – hereafter Ishizuka). Further, claims 3, 9, 14 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sundahl in view of Ishizuka as applied to claims 1, 7, 13 and 17 above, and further in view of Miyashita et al. (JP-361261921A – hereafter Miyashita). These rejections are respectfully traversed at least for the reasons provided below.

With regard to independent claim 1, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite, *inter alia*, the features of “a temperature detection unit which detects a temperature; an A/D conversion circuit which converts detected data into digital data; a storage unit in which a temperature characteristic and an aging characteristic of the light-emitting element are stored; an arithmetic operation unit which calculates a lighting period of each pixel using the digital data, the temperature characteristic, and a digital video signal; a count unit which counts a cumulated lighting period of each pixel using an output of the arithmetic operation unit; and a correction unit which corrects the digital video signal to be inputted to each pixel using the aging characteristic and the cumulated lighting period and supplies the corrected digital video signal to the display panel.” (See at least paragraphs [0037] to [0039] of published application). The Examiner asserts that Sundahl teaches a display device comprising a display panel which is equipped with pixels including, a light-emitting element, an aging characteristic of the light-emitting element are stored, an arithmetic operation unit which calculates a lighting period of each pixel using an output of the arithmetic operation unit and a correction unit which corrects the video signal to be inputted to each pixel using the aging

characteristic and the cumulated lighting period and supplies the corrected video signal to the display panel. However, Applicants contend that Sundahl fails to disclose, teach or suggest the arithmetic operation unit and the count unit, as claimed. Although Sundahl discloses a circuit (FIG. 4), Sundahl's circuit merely is used to estimate current or voltage via a measure characteristic, such as reverse bias resistance (paragraph [0022] of Sundahl). It appears that the Examiner merely states, without clear support, that the circuit of Sundahl is equivalent to the features of an arithmetic operation unit and a count unit. However, Applicants contend that Sundahl fails to disclose the features of a temperature detection unit which detects a temperature; an A/D conversion circuit which converts detected data into digital data; a storage unit in which a temperature characteristic and an aging characteristic of the light-emitting element are stored; an arithmetic operation unit which calculates a lighting period of each pixel using the digital data, the temperature characteristic, and a digital video signal; a count unit which counts a cumulated lighting period of each pixel using an output of the arithmetic operation unit; and a correction unit which corrects the digital video signal to be inputted to each pixel using the aging characteristic and the cumulated lighting period and supplies the corrected digital video signal to the display panel, as presently claimed. Similar arguments can be made with regard to independent claims, 7, 13 and 17 as well. Thus, it cannot be said that Sundahl, taken alone or in combination with the cited secondary references, makes obvious the present invention, as presently claimed.

The Examiner further asserts that Sundahl discloses that temperature also affects the degradation of luminance of the device and multiple characteristics may be measured and/or combined to provide a more definitive indication of degradation and required correction than available from a single set of measurements, which clearly suggest that temperature compensation can be used to overcome degradation. In addition, the Examiner asserts that Ishizuka discloses temperature compensation by having a temperature detection unit, a storage unit, an arithmetic operation unit, and that it would have been obvious to use the feature of temperature compensation, where the measured temperature signal of Ishizuka is added to the display device of Sundahl, so as to produce a device that is able to compensate for both aging and temperature degradation and to provide a display apparatus even in the case of changing display luminance of a light-emitting panel. However, the arithmetic operation unit (33B of Ishizuka) merely adjusts the light adjustment signal for compensating

temperature dependency of the light emission characteristics but does not compensate for deterioration caused by temperature change. Thus, the arithmetic operation unit (33B) of Ishizuka fails to cure the noted deficiencies in Sundahl and fails to teach or suggest an arithmetic operation unit, as presently claimed.

Similarly, Miyashita fails to cure the deficiencies in Sundahl and Ishizuka, as discussed above. Accordingly, amended independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 17 are allowable over the applied references, taken alone or in combination. The dependent claims are allowable over the applied references, taken alone or in combination, on their merits and for at least the reasons as argued above with respect to their independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 17. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of all dependent claims likewise be removed.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing it is respectfully requested that the rejections of record be reconsidered and withdrawn by the Examiner, that claims 1-3, 7-9, 13, 14, 17 and 18 be allowed and that the application be passed to issue. If a conference would expedite prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean A. Pryor, Reg. # 48103/
Sean A. Pryor

NIXON PEABODY LLP
CUSTOMER NO.: 22204
401 9th Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, DC 20004
Tel: 202-585-8000
Fax: 202-585-8080